

**MINUTES
OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (HPAC)
OF
ARIZONA STATE PARKS
MEETING OF December 15, 2008
City of Tempe Council Chambers
31 East 5th St.
Tempe, AZ**

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Thorne called the meeting to order at 10:13am. Ms. Shulman called the roll and noted that there was a quorum.

Committee Members Present:	Winston Thorne, Chair Tess Nesser Joe Nucci Bonnie Bariola Tami Ryall Vic Linoff
----------------------------	---

Committee Members Absent:	Charles Ebner
---------------------------	---------------

Arizona State Parks Staff Present:	Doris Pulsifer, Chief of Grants Vivia Strang, Historic Preservation Grants Coordinator Pat Dutrack, Grants Coordinator, LWCF Bill Collins, SHPO Ruth Shulman, Advisory Group Coordinator
------------------------------------	---

Guests:	None
---------	------

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

This item dispensed with in the interest of time.

C. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

Chair Thorne entertained nominations for the Chair and Vice-Chair of HPAC. Ms Nesser nominated Chair Thorne to retain his seat as Chair for the coming year. Mr. Linoff seconded the motion. Chair Thorne noted that he would entertain a motion for the Vice-Chair and consolidate the election votes. Mr. Linoff nominated Ms. Nesser to retain her seat as Vice-Chair for the coming year. Ms. Ryall seconded the motion. Chair Thorne called for the vote for Chair and Vice-Chair, which carried with no further discussion,

D. ACTION ITEMS

1. Approval of the October 20, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Linoff moved to approve the minutes as presented. Ms. Ryall seconded the motion, which carried with no further discussion.

2. Review and approval of changes to the FY2009 Historic Preservation Heritage Fund Grant Manual and Program

Mr. Nucci said that he had very minor changes to the draft manual as presented. On page 15, he would like to have the grant program highlights and deadlines section restored, especially with regards to the Conservation Easement deadline. He noted that on page 16, he sees the acronym "AEPA" used without spelling out that it stands for Architecture, Engineering and Pre-Agreement costs. Also on page 16, he would like to remove the capitalization of "cap" in the fifth bullet point. On page 17, Mr. Nucci would like to see more detail in the Project Narrative and Rating Criteria section, such as identifying line items to help orient applicants. Mr. Nucci also asked that on page 20 he would like to see examples of pre-award costs, other than the AEPA example provided. Ms. Strang noted that a definition of pre-award costs occurs in the second paragraph.

Mr. Nucci continued that on page 21 he notes that "overmatching" in regards to matching funds is encouraged, and wondered if overmatching is discretionary. He was under the impression that if the matching funds are provided in cash, then overmatching is mandatory. He continued to page 24 where he asked how many pages are in the Administrative Guidelines referred to. Moving to page 50, Mr. Nucci said he found the form hard to read, though it may be an artifact of the copying process. He suggested using a bold-face type. On page 63, Mr. Nucci suggested rewording the final sentence in the second paragraph to say "on time" or "in a timely manner" or the like. He noted that on page 65 he did not understand the "applicant's consultant" language. Mr. Nucci's final comment was that he loved the supplemental information section.

Chair Thorne asked Ms. Strang to send everyone a .pdf copy of the manual with changes.

Mr. Linoff moved to accept the grant manual as amended by discussion and to forward it to the Arizona State Parks Board for final approval. Mr. Nucci seconded the motion, which carried with no further discussion.

E. WORK SESSION

Chair Thorne opened the work session by discussing the recent HPAC presentation to the Arizona State Parks Board (ASPB). He noted that it was interesting to hear the different advisory committees and their interests and concerns. He also said that it was good to see the ASPB and their receptiveness to HPAC's ideas. Mr. Linoff said that it was good to have received the draft copy of HPAC's portion of the ASPB meeting minutes. He said also that he felt these presentations helped the ASPB to understand the work done by the advisory committees to provide quality advice to the ASPB. Mr. Linoff went on to note that the presentation asked ASPB to consider developing a policy against the redirection of grant program funds away from grants. He asked that during 2009 HPAC and the ASPB continue to enjoy more interaction. One way to open dialog would be to provide the ASPB with the HPAC minutes.

Mr. Linoff also noted that William Scalzo, the ASPB Chair, had spoken with Mr. Driggs of the Arizona Centennial planning group about involving HPAC in the centennial. Ms. Strang noted that in 1993/94 a Heritage Fund Historic Preservation (HFHP) grant had paid for a Building Condition Assessment (BCA) the old state capitol building. Further discussion on the centennial followed. Ms. Pulsifer will obtain the information packet on centennial planning.

Returning to the ASPB presentation and dialog, Mr. Nucci asked if the presentation had been accompanied by slides of completed projects to represent HPAC's accomplishments, and were those accomplishments new information to the ASPB. Chair Thorne said yes to both questions, noting that the slides provided both visual learning and enforcement of the importance of the HFHP program. Mr. Linoff also noted that it helped reinforce the idea that diverting grant funds to other uses is not productive. Ms. Nesser asked if the Picket Post House purchase had been used as an example of grant fund diversion. Chair Thorne said that the Picket Post House had not been specifically used as an example; rather, the dialog revolved around maintaining a successful grant program, and making the ASPB more aware of the HPAC contribution. Mr. Linoff also said that the discussion with the ASPB helped to re-educate the ASPB and introduced the idea that HPAC wants a consistent process to deal with grant fund diversion. Mr. Nucci asked that Staff include a section on each HPAC agenda to discuss other dialogs with the ASPB. Further discussion on ASPB dialog, especially toward forming a policy against grant fund "raids" followed.

Mr. Nucci asked about the agenda note regarding HFHP grants to Native American communities. Mr. Linoff noted that Native American communities are eligible to apply for HPHF grants. Ms. Pulsifer said that the note on the agenda was added in response to a remark from a member of the ASPB. Mr. Nucci asked whether further advertisement to the tribes would be effective in garnering more applications.

Mr. Linoff said he would like to have the ASPB advocate for a greater portion of the state Lottery funds to go into the Heritage Fund. Chair Thorne said that would be a discussion item for the ASPB; Mr. Linoff said that HPAC is willing to provide support should ASPB go ahead.

Mr. Nucci noted that the final page of the agenda packet show what could be accomplished if more funds were available for the HFHP grants. He further noted that HPAC had stayed within ASP mandated guidelines to determine priority grant funding when making recommendations. Chair Thorne noted that the City of Glendale is a good example of the positive effect of historic preservation on communities from a business standpoint – the various projects represent a good return on equity for the funds expended, and downtown Glendale has revitalized.

Mr. Linoff noted that the current economic climate might mean lean times for matching funds from applicants. Chair Thorne agreed that the match is important, but asked what would happen if there were no matching funds available. Mr. Nucci said that he felt less emphasis should be placed on the match. Mr. Linoff also noted that funds remaining in the grant program after the grant awards are made should be protected from redirection by ASP. Ms. Pulsifer said that in the current state budget crisis, any remaining fund balances in any program are subject to "sweep". (Ms. Ryall left at 11:55am.)

Ms. Pulsifer went on to say that in response to previous discussions regarding the administrative compliance (a score designed to rate how applicants have administered any prior grants) section of the grant scoring process, she had developed a new "version" that would be consistent across all of ASP's grant programs. She gave HPAC members a handout. In this new version of rating administrative compliance, that section would consist of 100 points to be scored separately. Ms. Strang developed a "technical review" of the application itself, modeled after the technical review required of Federal grant applications, as part of this separate section.

Mr. Nucci noted that this proposal looks very much like the proposal he had prepared for dealing with administrative compliance. He noted some minor differences but said that the allotted points lined up in the same way. Discussion followed on the structure of the allotted points and the technical review. Ms. Strang noted that there are essentially two parts to the review; one outlines “deal-breakers” which are items that render an application ineligible up-front. The other outlines application formatting areas. The committee discussed the technical review in some detail.

Mr. Nucci said that he was uncomfortable with adding rating points to the application section dealing with “Public Involvement and Support” and “Public Benefit”. He does not want to see emphasis added to the involvement and support areas. Ms. Strang said that project planners and grant writers often leave out the public when planning a project. Often, the extent of public involvement is the gathering of signatures in a petition drive. Ms. Bariola noted that public involvement is key. The support of the local community, especially in certain types of projects, is important. Chair Thorne also noted that community support should be active, showing that the community wants the project to be ultimately sustainable. Mr. Nucci countered that the public involvement is harder to quantify, and that the bulk of the points should belong to the Public Benefit section. He went on to say that he would shift points to add to the public benefit line at B1A, but all-in-all this new version was very close to his proposal.

Chair Thorne also said that project planning should be paramount, and the rating should have no subjective areas. Mr. Nucci agreed that planning makes the difference between a decent project and a great project. Mr. Linoff asked why the National Register Nomination (NRN) is a requirement. Mr. Collins replied that it is designed to get people to register their properties.

Mr. Linoff asked why, in the grant rating process, every applicant doesn’t receive 100 points to start and then have deductions from that score made as deficiencies arise. Ms. Bariola said that as the HPAC representative on the grant rating team for both 2008 cycles, she could see why a point deduction system would not be feasible, especially when considering whether or not applicants follow instructions on providing information. Mr. Collins said that, functionally, grant scoring is deductive in any case. Chair Thorne asked if HPAC was in agreement about the administrative criteria and matching funds changes. The committee replied that they were, and if any areas required review, that could be dealt with in future grant cycles. Ms. Pulsifer noted that the technical review linked the two criteria.

Mr. Linoff moved that HPAC accept the proposed changes to the grant rating and scoring system with regards to the administrative compliance and matching funds sections. Mr. Nucci seconded the motion, which carried with no further discussion.

F. REPORTS

1. Parks Board Actions on HPAC Items

Ms. Pulsifer noted that the ASP Board at their last meeting had approved the extension request for Historic Preservation Fund Project #640307 – the Center for Desert Archaeology – Coalescent Communities in Arizona for one year. The ASP Board also approved HPAC’s recommendation to reappoint Winston Thorne and Joseph Nucci to new three-year terms beginning January 1, 2009.

2. Grant Staff Update

Ms. Strang reported that she had attended the “big check” presentation ceremony in Springerville, and the town is very excited about their project. She passed along the town’s thanks to HPAC. She also attended the award ceremony for the Florence Courthouse, and noted that the repairs to the courthouse at McFarland State Historic Park are awaiting bids from contractors.

3. SHPO Reports

Mr. Collins said that Kathryn Leonard resigned from SHPO, leaving no National Register Nomination coordinator. With the state hiring freeze, agencies are prevented from replacing staff, which will cause some issues regarding the National Register as well as other areas of SHPO suffering staff attrition. He also noted that the annual conference is upcoming.

G. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No response.

**H. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS, MATTERS OF BOARD PROCEDURE,
REQUESTS AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS**

Items requested for future agendas include: discussing the meeting time for HPAC meetings; create a standing agenda item for ASP Board discussion matters; invite ASPB to the March HPAC meeting.

I. MEETING DATE REVIEW

Mr. Nucci will investigate the availability of the Tempe City Council Chambers for the January 26, 2009 meeting. The March 16, 2009 meeting is scheduled to take place in Florence, Arizona.

J. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Thorne adjourned the meeting at 1:05pm.